

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/553,122

Attorney Docket No.: Q90886

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicant is submitting herewith two (2) sheets of replacement drawings, which include FIGS. 5-7. FIGS. 5-7 have been amended to include the legend -- Prior Art--.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Clams 1 and 3 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, claim 2 has been canceled.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawing figures filed on October 14, 2005. In response, Applicant has labeled FIGS. 5-7 as --Prior Art--.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Schairer (US 5,384,471).

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schairer in view of Maruyama (JP 11-163411) or Applicant's prior art admissions (APA).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the recitations of dependent claim 2 and to recite that the first and second lead members are *bent at respective portions adjacent to the large width lead segments*.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 at least because there is no reasonable combination of Schairer and Maruyama or the APA that would meet all of the claim's recitations. For example, there is no reasonable combination of Schairer and Maruyama or the APA that would meet the claimed device in which the first and second lead members are bent at respective portions adjacent to the large width lead segments.

The Examiner acknowledges that Schairer does not disclose bending of the lead members. Therefore, the Examiner looks to the structure of Maruyama or the APA. For

example, Prior Art FIG. 7 of the original specification shows the first and second bent lead members 56a, 56b.

However, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no reason to combine the various applied references so that both the first and second lead members are *bent at respective portions adjacent to the large width lead segments*. For example, Schairer does not disclose that the lead members are bent. Moreover, there is nothing in Maruyama or the APA that would suggest the specifically recited location of bending, i.e., *at respective portions adjacent to the large width lead segments*.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1.

In addition, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 3 at least because of its dependency from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/553,122

Attorney Docket No.: Q90886

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/John M. Bird/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

John M. Bird
Registration No. 46,027

Date: February 14, 2008